



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

AW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,509	05/02/2001	David A. Christopher	35451/119 (3597.Palm)	7864
26371	7590	11/10/2003	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER 777 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 3800 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-5308			DATSKOVSKIY, MICHAEL V	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2835

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/847,509	Applicant(s) CHRISTOPHER, DAVID A.
	Examiner Michael V Datskovskiy	Art Unit 2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,6,8-13 and 15-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,6,8-13 and 15-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 May 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 6, 8-13, 15-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: It was left being dependent on the canceled claim 5. For the further prosecution claim 6 will be considered as dependent on claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-4, 6, 8-10, 13, 15-16, 20-26, 28-30 and 35-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schlack et al.

Regarding to the claims 35-39: The method steps are inherently necessitated by the device structure as Schlack et al et al describe it.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2835

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 11-12, 17-19, 27, 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlack et al. for: a secure digital card (SD), or a multimedia card (MMC), or a battery, or a cellular phone transceiver, or a camera, or a MP3 player being inserted into a card slot of the docking station (By Schlack et al expansion cards are memory cards without specifying their kind). Card- type peripheral devices such as digital cameras, rechargeable batteries packs, MP3 players, cellular phones, input-output connectors, displays, etc are well known in the art (Good examples are: a card-type digital cameras described in the Japanese Patent JP411243501A by Osawa, US Patent 6,292,272 by Okauchi et al and US Patent 6,118,485 by Hinoue et al; a card-type MP3 Player described by Kim in the Korean patent 2001026970A; a card-type display described by Fukushi in the Japan Patent JP02001101356A; a card-type rechargeable batteries pack described in the article: "Personal Computer Menu Card International Association Compatible battery and Charging cards", IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, September 1993, US Vol.36, Issue 9A, Pages 167-170; a card type cellular phone described by Ishibashi in the Japan patent JP020000921171A; and a card type input-output connectors described by Ozawa et al in the US Patent Re. 36, 769). It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use said card slots to insert a secure digital card (SD), or a multimedia card (MMC), or a rechargeable battery, or a cellular phone transceiver, or a digital camera, or a MP3 player, since applicant has not disclosed that a type of the inserted

Art Unit: 2835

device solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any kind of available electronic device having appropriate size and electrical connection.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Walters et al (US Patent 6,453,281, see Figs. 30-31 and the related description).

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael V Datskovskiy whose telephone number is 306-4535. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on (703) 308-4815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-3431.

Primary Examiner

Michael Datskovsky



October 31, 2003.